DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 630 CS 506 420

AUTHOR Walker, James R.
TITLE More than Meets the Ear: A Factor Analysis of Student Impressions of Television Talk Show Hosts.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (74th, New Orleans, LA, November 3-6, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; *Audience Response; Commercial Television; Higher Education; Mass Media; Popular Culture; *Public Opinion; *Student Attitudes; Television Research; Television Surveys; Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS Carson (Johnny); Donahue (Phil); Letterman (David); *Talk Show Hosts; Talk Shows; Winfrey (Oprah)

ABSTRACT

To identify the descriptors most frequently associated with four popular television talk show hosts and to isolate the fundamental dimensions of the images of those talk show hosts, a study surveyed 209 students from Memphis State University and the University of Arkansas (Little Rock) about their impressions of Johnny Carson, David Letterman, Oprah Winfrey, and Phil Donahue. Three items--exposure, saliency, and familiarity--were used to construct viewer involvement. In a pilot study, students from different universities listed all of the words they associated with each of the four talk show hosts. The most frequently listed descriptors and their opposites were used to create the semantic differential scales for this study. The images of the four hosts were assessed using four instruments of 20 nine-point semantic differential scales. Separate factor analyses were run on each group of 20 semantic differential scales. Analyses revealed that Carson was characterized by his class, Letterman by his arrogant wit, Winfrey by her appearance and concern, and Donahue by his competence and liberalness. (Nine tables of data are appended). (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299630

More than Meets the Ear:
A Factor Analysis of Student Impressions of Television Talk Show Hosts

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James R. Walker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

James R. Walker
143 Theatre & Communication Arts
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
901-454-2565

A paper presented at
the convention of the
Speech Communication Association
New Orleans, LA
November, 1988.

CS506420

Introduction

Although successful talk show hosts are among the most durable and highly rated personalities on television, few studies of these hosts or their programs have appeared in communication journals. Researchers have examined related topics such as the political impact of Sunday morning network news interview programs (Adams & Ferber, 1977) and the PBS series "Firing Line" (Hammerback, 1974), as well as the interpersonal functions of talk radio (Bierig & Dimmick, 1979; Turow, 1974). Equally surprising is the lack of any published analyses of television performer images. Despite the established use of quantitative measures of performer likability and recognizability such as TvQs in entertainment programming decisions (Head & Sterling, 1987, p. 400; Lewine, Eastman, & Adams, 1985, p. 141), communication scholars have not used empirical techniques to describe performer images. To date, the subject of the daily television talk show host has been examined exclusively by cultural/critical scholars (Buxton, 1987; Katriel & Philipsen, 1981; Reeves, 1984; Timberg, 1987).

Several of these scholars have provided useful insights into the characteristics of these hosts and their programs. In their analysis of the Phil Donahue show, Katriel and Philipsen (1981) commented on the program's "generally supportive" climate and the high value assigned to "communication" in dealing with interpersonal problems. Buxton's (1987) analysis of late night talk shows suggests that with Johnny Carson, "hosting the late-night talk show assumes an air of diplomacy" (p. 380) and that

"Carson does not overtly seek controversy" (p. 381). Buxton has also noted David Letterman's tendency to initiate conversation "that often revolves around ridicule" (p. 382). Reeve's (1984) comments are especially pointed in this regard:

> Treating common folk valorized in Carson's discourse with a contempt that often verges on cruelty, Letterman frequently goes for cheap laughs at other's expense. Laughing <u>at</u> people, Letterman's comic repertoire includes spiking naive guests with rude asides, calling common people on the phone and ridiculing their simpleness, bullying Larry 'Bud' Melman, and making casual fun of fat people. (Quoted in Buxton, 1987, p. 382).

Letterman is also perceived as distinctive in that he "toys" (Buxton, 1987, p. 385) or "plays" (Timberg, 1987, p. 391) with the the medium and "actively flirt[s] with chaos" (Timberg, 1987, p. 397). These critics suggest that one of Letterman's intentions is to violate the conventions of talk television usually adhered to by other hosts.

Although critics have provided useful insights into the images of talk show hosts, their methods do not systematically tap the viewer's conscious perceptions of these hosts. Thus, the purpose of this paper was to begin the process of empirically establishing the dimensions of the audience's image of several popular television talk hosts by reporting the results of an exploratory, quantitative investigation of the images of four well known personalities: Johnny Carson, David Letterman, Oprah Winfrey, and Phil Donahue. The results will include the means,

standard deviations and frequencies for 20 semantic differential scales developed for each host. Using factor analyses, these four sets of 20 scales will be reduced to their more fundamental images. In addition, the relationship between program viewing involvement and variations in the images of these four talk show hosts will be explored.

Viewing Involvement and Host Image

Both Schramm (1954) and Becker (1978) have suggested the effects of a particular mass media message will be modified by the larger information context of the message. Schramm's (1954) analogy between the formation of stalagmites and the effects of communication on human development illustrates how exposure to different mass media messages might gradually influence personality. Schramm (p. 125) suggests that the media produces effects just as "the stalagmite builds up from the calcareous residue of the water dripping on it from the cave roof." Each drop leaves "only a tiny residue." Similarly,

> when we introduce one drop of communication into a person where millions of drops have already fallen and left their residue, we can hardly expect to reshape the personality fundamentally by that one drop (p. 125).

However, many "drops" of communication can leave a lasting impression.

Similarly, Becker's (1978) mosaic model of communication highlights the role of memory in assessing the impact of new "bits" of information. For most topics there is an almost infinite collection of information bits among which the audience

consumes only a small amount. Audience choices are governed, in turn, by existing attitudes and pictures of reality. New bits of information are added to existing memory about a topic and also interact with related message sets (attitudes). Thus, in the typical situation, new information bits may have a limited influence.

Both Schramm and Becker suggest that the individual's previously accumulated experience with the subject matter is of prime importance in predicting the impact of a message on attitudes. From this perspective, the longevity and regularity of the television talk show makes it an especially interesting subject of study. Since television talk shows are typically presented daily and since successful hosts can command a national audience for decades, audiences are presented with repeated opportunities to develop images of television talk show personalities. These characteristics of the genre also allow viewers to vary greatly in their level of involvement in the programs. Assuming that most hosts present a relatively consistent persona, the greater opportunity for involvement should produce strong relationships between the extent of viewer involvement and the tendency to concur with the prevailing images of talk show hosts.

While this study posits a theoretical connection between involvement and the perceptions of host image, prior research has found that demographic variables, as well as attitudes toward television viewing (Rubin, 1981) and perceived reality of television (Rubin, 1981) are related to perceptions of television

programming. In an attempt to separate the influence of these variables on variations in the images of television talk show hosts, these potentially confounding variables were controlled for by the use of partial correlations.

Thus, it was hypothesized that, after controlling for the possible influence of confounding variables, the extent of a viewer's involvement with a talk show host would be significantly related to his/her perceptions of that host. Involvement should be positively related to favorable dimensions and negatively related to unfavorable dimensions of a host's image.

Method

Subjects

The respondents were 209 students enrolled in introductory undergraduate communication courses at Memphis State University (n = 155) and the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (n = 54). Although participation was voluntary, less than one percent of the students refused to participate or provided substantially incomplete questionnaires. Questionnaires were administered during regular classes by course instructors, following written instructions. Respondents were told only that the purpose of the questionnaire was to gather information about student attitudes on topics of national interest.

Predictor Variable

Three items (exposure, saliency, and familiarity) were used to construct viewer involvement. Exposure to each talk show was measured using a single six-point item that asked how often respondents watched a particular talk show: 4 or 5 times a week,

2 or 3 times a week, once a week, 2 or 3 times a month, once a month, almost never, or never. The saliency of each talk show host was measured using one nine-point important/unimportant semantic differential scale. Likewise, the familiarity of each talk show host was measured using one nine-point familiar/unfamiliar semantic differential scale. Involvement with each talk show host was measured by summing each respondent's exposure, saliency, and familiarity scores, after standardizing each variable by converting raw scores into z-scores.

Criterion Variables

In a pilot study, students from the University of Utah (N=26), UCLA (N=12), the University of Michigan (N=45), and Rutgers University at Newark (N=44) listed all of the words they associated with each of four talk show hosts: Johnny Carson, David Letterman, Oprah Winfrey, and Phil Donahue. The most frequently listed descriptors and their opposites were used to create the semantic differential scales reported here. The images of four talk show hosts were assessed using four instruments of 20 nine-point semantic differential scales (see Tables 1-4).

Separate factor analyses were run on each group of 20 semantic differential scales (see Tables 5-8). The factors generated in these analyses were used to create the image variables used in this study. These criterion variables were created by summing the scales loading on a factor after weighting

each item by its factor loading. The response scale was reversed for negatively loading items.

Control Variables

Five variables were used to control for the influence of differences in demographics and attitudes toward television on the criterion variables. The control variables were sex, age, household income, perceived reality of television (Rubin, 1981), and attitudes toward television (Rubin, 1981).

Data Analyses

Data analyses were performed using the SPSSX statistical package program. No variable had more than two percent missing data. Missing responses to semantic differential scales were scored as five, the mid-point score for these scales. Missing data for the demographic variables were replaced with variable median (income, age) or mode (sex) scores. No other variables contained missing data.

Results

Descriptive Data

Means and standard deviations for semantic differential scales for each talk show host are reported in Tables 1-4. As the mean for a particular scale approaches one, the descriptor generated in the pilot study (listed on the left in Tables 1-4) was more closely associated with the particular talk show host. Using a mean of less than three as a dividing point, the descriptors most frequently associated with Johnny Carson were famous, rich, successful, well dressed, and friendly. The descriptors associated with David Letterman were sarcastic,

silly, blunt, outrageous, quick thinking, and aggressive. For Oprah Winfrey, the descriptors were successful, friendly, inquisitive, fat, intelligent, caring, genuine, knowledgeable, and good interviewer. For Phil Donahue, the descriptors were successful, inquisitive, aggressive, knowledgeable, intelligent, encourages interaction, and controversial.

Factor Analyses

The results of the factor analyses of the four TV host semantic differential scales are presented in Tables 5-8. All four analyses used principal components analysis with a varimax rotation. Items were were assigned to a particular factor if their strongest loading was on that factor, the loading was above .4, and the loading was at least twice as strong on that factor as on any other factor.

The factor analysis of Johnny Carson image scales produced a five factor solution. Factor 1 (general image) included intelligent, distinguished, inquisitive, and friendly items. Factor 2 (hippness) included two negatively loaded items: square and corny. Factor 3 (arrogance) included rude, conceited, and judgemental items. Factor 4 (wealth) was composed of a single item: rich. Factor 5 (marital status) was composed of a single item: divorced. These five factors accounted for 61.4% of the variance.

The analysis of the David Letterman image scales produced a three factor solution. Factor 1 (general image) included eight items: funny, entertaining, quick thinking, great, intelligent, original, insightful, and old (negatively loaded). Factor 2

(arrogance) included four items: rude, judgemental, blunt, conceited. Factor 3 (strangeness) consisted of the single item: strange. The three factors accounted for 60.3% of the variance.

A three factor solution was obtained for the Oprah Winfrey image scales. Factor 1 (general image) included five items: caring, friendly, intelligent, inquisitive, genuine and conceited (negatively loaded). Factor 2 (appearance) consisted of one negatively loaded item: fat. Factor 3 (controversy) consisted of three items: aggressive, daring, and controversial. The three factors accounted for 58.7% of the variance.

The analysis of the Phil Donahue image scales produced a four factor solution with Factor 1 (general image) including knowledgeable, intelligent, successful, and inquisitive items. Factor 2 (arrogance) consisted of three items: rude, blunt, and conceited. Factor 3 (liberalness) consisted of one item: liberal. Factor 4 (conflict) also consisted of one item: devil's advocate. The four factors accounted for 59.7% of the variance.

Involvement and Image

A partial correlation procedure was used to test the strength of the relationships between involvement, familiarity, saliency, and program exposure and each of the image factors (criterion variables) after controlling for sex, age, household income, perceived reality of television, and attitudes toward television. These results are reported in Table 9. For all of talk show hosts, the strongest factor (the factor accounting for the most variance)--labeled general image--was positively and

significantly correlated with involvement, familiarity, saliency, and program exposure. The magnitude of these correlations was high with the strongest correlations occurring between involvement and the general image variables. The correlations between involvement, familiarity, saliency, and program exposure and the other images factors were weaker, although most were statistically significant ($p < .01$). Typically, the last (weakest) factor extracted was not significantly related to any of the predictor variables

Conclusions

The primary purpose of this study was to identify the descriptors most frequently associated with four television talk show hosts--Johnny Carson, David Letterman, Oprah Winfrey, Phil Donahue--and to isolate the fundamental dimensions of the images of those talk show hosts. Of secondary concern was the analysis of the relationship between viewer involvement with a particular host and the dimensions of host image identified in this study.

Many of the descriptors identified here were consistent with those suggested by cultural/critical scholars (Buxton, 1987; Reeves, 1984; Timberg, 1987). The descriptors most frequently associated with Johnny Carson--famous, rich, successful, well-dressed, and friendly--suggest that viewers as a group have focused on Carson's role as senior statesmen among talk show hosts (Buxton, 1987). These descriptors could apply to a benevolent leader in almost any profession. David Letterman's descriptors centered on his humor, which was perceived as quick witted and silly but also sarcastic and blunt (Buxton, 1987;

Reeves, 1984). Oprah Winfrey's descriptors identified her as the successful "earth mother" of talk show hosts. Respondents saw her as friendly, fat, caring, and genuine, but also successful, knowledgeable, intelligent, inquisitive, and a good interviewer. Phil Donahue descriptors were similar to Oprah Winfrey's except they lacked the caring/friendly dimension. Donahue was also seen as more controversial.

Although the analyses of each host's strongest descriptors provide insights into the general image of each host, the use of factor analysis reveals the different dimensions of that image. The factor analysis of the 20 descriptors of Johnny Carson isolated five factors. The first "general image" factor seemed to reflect Carson's class image, the second factor his humor, and the third his relationship with his guests. The last two factors "wealth" and "marital status" reflected two widely publicized aspects of his personal life. Fewer dimensions surfaced in David Letterman's image. The first "general image" factor focused upon his intelligent wit, the second "arrogance" factor on his interactions with his guests, and the third "strangeness" factor on his tendency to rupture the expectations of his audience (Buxton, 1987; Timberg, 1987). Oprah Winfrey's image centered upon her role as a "concerned host" (Factor 1), her physical appearance (Factor 2), and the controversy (Factor 3) that pervades of many of her programs. Donahue's factors were more focused upon competency (Factor 1), interactions with guests (Factor 2 "arrogance" and Factor 4 "conflict"), and his perceived liberalness (Factor 3). To summarize, Carson was characterized

by his class, Letterman by his arrogant wit, Winfrey by her appearance and concern, and Donahue by his competency and liberalness.

As was hypothesized, the results of the partial correlation analyses revealed strong relationships between viewer involvement and most of these image dimensions. The relationships were strongest for the strongest factors, those accounting for the largest part of the variance in the factor analyses. These relationships were positive for favorable characteristics (competency, wit, and concern) and negative for unfavorable characteristics (arrogance). For all hosts, the composite involvement variable was almost always more strongly related to the image dimensions than either familiarity, saliency, or program exposure alone. These results suggest that future program research might benefit from using more complex measures of viewer involvement, such as the one used here, rather than simple measures of viewer exposure to a program.

The limited sample examined here demands a cautious interpretation of these results. Nonetheless, this exploratory study of the images projected by television talk show personalities suggests that word association techniques and factor analysis can be effectively used to reveal the dimensions of host image. It also appears that an audience's acceptance of that image is directly related to its degree of involvement with the host. The more viewers come to "know" a host, the more they come to perceive a consensus persona.

References

Adams, W. C., & Ferber, P. H. (1977). Television interview shows: The politics of visibility. Journal of Broadcasting, 21, 141-151.

Bierig, J., & Dimmick, J. (1979). Late night radio talk show as interpersonal communication. Journalism Quarterly, 56, 92-96.

Buxton, R. A. (1987). The late-night talk show: Humor in fringe television. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 52, 377-389.

Hammerback, J. C. (1974). William F. Buckley, Jr., on Firing Line: A case study in confrontational dialogue. Today's Speech, 22, 23-30.

Head, S. W., & Sterling, C. H. (1987). Broadcasting in America: A survey of the electronic media (5th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Katriel, T., & Philipsen, G. (1981). "What we need is communication": "Communication" as a cultural category in some American speech. Communication Monographs, 48, 301-317.

Lewine, R. F., Eastman, S. T., & Adams, W. J. (1985). Prime-Time network television programming. In S. T. Eastman, S. W. Head, & L. Klein, Broadcast/Cable programming: Strategies and Practices (2nd ed.) (pp. 119-145). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Reeves, J. (1984). Star discourse and television: A critical approach. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.

Rubin, A. M. (1981). An examination of television viewing

motivations. Communication Research, 8, 141-165.

Timberg, B. (1987). Television talk and ritual space: Carson and Letterman. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 52, 390-402.

Turow, J. (1974). Talk show radio as interpersonal communication. Journal of Broadcasting, 18, 171-179.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations

Semantic Differential Items for Johnny Carson

	M	SD	
FAMOUS	1.4	1.02	UNKNOWN
RICH	1.5	.96	POOR
SUCCESSFUL	1.7	1.34	UNSUCCESSFUL
WELL DRESSED	2.4	1.63	POORLY DRESSED
FRIENDLY	2.8	1.63	UNFRIENDLY
OLD	3.0	1.36	YOUNG
ENTERTAINING	3.0	1.91	BORING
INTELLIGENT	3.1	1.51	STUPID
DISTINGUISHED	3.3	1.86	UNDISTINGUISHED
INQUISITIVE	3.4	1.69	NOT INQUISITIVE
ORIGINAL	3.5	1.97	UNORIGINAL
FUNNY	3.5	1.82	NOT FUNNY
DIVORCED	3.7	3.30	MARRIED
GENUINE	3.7	1.87	PHONY
OVERRATED	4.1	1.67	UNDERRATED
JUDGEMENTAL	4.7	2.11	TOLERANT
CONCEITED	5.0	2.00	MODEST
CORNY	5.1	2.25	WITTY
SQUARE	5.5	1.75	HIP
RUDE	5.7	2.32	COURTEOUS

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations

Semantic Differential Items for David Letterman

	M	SD	
SARCASTIC	2.0	1.41	NOT SARCASTIC
SILLY	2.4	1.48	SERIOUS
BLUNT	2.4	1.71	TACTFUL
OUTRAGEOUS	2.7	1.78	NORMAL
QUICK THINKING	2.7	1.87	DULL
AGGRESSIVE	2.9	1.73	PASSIVE
ENTERTAINING	3.0	2.32	BORING
ORIGINAL	3.1	2.26	UNORIGINAL
RUDE	3.1	1.86	COURTEOUS
FUNNY	3.2	2.32	NOT FUNNY
JUDGEMENTAL	3.3	1.80	TOLERANT
STRANGE	3.3	1.97	TYPICAL
CONCEITED	3.7	2.02	MODEST
INTELLIGENT	3.8	1.92	STUPID
INSIGHTFUL	3.9	1.80	NOT PERCEPTIVE
FRIENDLY	4.2	1.90	UNFRIENDLY
GREAT	4.4	2.18	NOT GREAT
CORNY	4.8	2.76	WITTY
HANDSOME	5.6	1.90	UGLY
OLD	6.4	1.55	YOUNG

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations

Semantic Differential Items for Oprah Winfrey

	M	SD	
SUCCESSFUL	2.0	1.24	UNSUCCESSFUL
FRIENDLY	2.3	1.64	UNFRIENDLY
INQUISITIVE	2.5	1.71	NOT INQUISITIVE
FAT	2.6	1.52	THIN
INTELLIGENT	2.7	1.73	STUPID
CARING	2.7	1.82	UNCARING
GENUINE	2.8	2.03	PHONY
KNOWLEDGEABLE	2.8	1.71	IGNORANT
GOOD			BAD
INTERVIEWER	2.8	1.94	INTERVIEWER
AGGRESSIVE	3.2	1.62	PASSIVE
ENTERTAINING	3.2	2.16	BORING
ENERGETIC	3.2	1.75	INACTIVE
CONTROVERSIAL	3.3	1.87	UNCONTROVERSIAL
DARING	3.5	1.70	CAUTIOUS
ATTRACTIVE	4.0	2.18	UNATTRACTIVE
ORIGINAL	4.1	2.31	UNORIGINAL
FUNNY	4.6	2.23	NOT FUNNY
BLUNT	4.8	2.53	TACTFUL
CONCEITED	5.6	2.10	MODEST
ANNOYING	5.6	2.34	PLEASING

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations

Semantic Differential Items for Phil Donahue

	M	SD	
SUCCESSFUL	2.1	1.43	UNSUCCESSFUL
INQUISITIVE	2.4	1.67	NOT INQUISITIVE
AGGRESSIVE	2.4	1.43	PASSIVE
KNOWLEDGEABLE	2.5	1.62	IGNORANT
INTELLIGENT	2.6	1.70	STUPID
ENCOURAGES INTERACTION	2.7	1.87	DISCOURAGES INTERACTION
CONTROVERSIAL	2.8	1.74	UNCONTROVERSIAL
DRAMATIC	3.1	1.71	UNDRAMATIC
OLD	3.5	1.53	YOUNG
LIBERAL	3.5	2.05	CONSERVATIVE
GENUINE	3.6	2.20	PHONY
BLUNT	3.6	2.27	TACTFUL
DEVIL'S ADVOCATE	3.7	2.20	AGREEABLE
ENTERTAINING	3.8	2.35	BORING
OPEN-MINDED	4.0	2.27	CLOSE-MINDED
RUDE	4.2	2.22	COURTEOUS
CONCEITED	4.2	2.00	MODEST
CARING	4.3	2.08	UNCARING
HANDSOME	4.7	2.00	UGLY
FUNNY	5.3	2.20	NOT FUNNY

Table 5

Factor Analysis Johnny Carson Scales

	F 1	F 2	F 3	F 4	F 5
Intelligent	.77	.23	-.01	-.02	-.08
Distinguished	.68	.16	-.25	.10	.02
Inquisitive	.67	.06	-.00	.17	.09
Friendly	.66	.08	-.45	.18	.07
Well Dressed	.64	.12	-.03	.22	-.20
Entertaining	.59	.56	-.11	.14	.11
Genuine	.50	.28	-.35	.18	.17
Funny	.37	.72	.00	.08	.17
Square/Hip	-.14	-.68	.14	.02	-.07
Corny/Witty	-.19	-.68	.04	.04	.27
Over/Underrated	.13	-.62	.40	-.15	.22
Original	.44	.52	.00	-.07	.32
Rude	-.23	.02	.84	-.03	.07
Conceited	-.02	-.20	.80	.03	-.08
Judgemental	-.09	-.07	.72	.08	.11
Rich	.09	.01	.04	.84	-.06
Famous	.40	.10	.01	.72	.01
Successful	.46	.20	-.02	.61	-.07
Old	-.07	-.29	-.03	.51	.33
Divorced	.00	.03	.08	.01	.83

Table 6

Factor Analysis David Letterman Scales

	F 1	F 2	F 3
Funny	.88	.16	.01
Entertaining	.87	.03	-.03
Quick Thinking	.83	.17	.08
Great	.82	.07	-.12
Intelligent	.77	-.02	-.03
Original	.77	.04	.17
Insightful	.77	-.01	.02
Friendly	.57	-.50	.23
Old/Young	-.51	-.14	.08
Handsome	.46	-.14	-.36
Rude	-.07	.83	.17
Judgemental	.07	.74	.10
Blunt	.17	.73	.22
Sarcastic	.27	.70	.38
Conceited	-.23	.68	.14
Outrageous	.33	.55	.44
Aggressive	.47	.53	-.06
Strange	-.04	.34	.72
Silly	.11	.47	.61
Corny	-.49	.04	.51

Table 7

Factor Analysis Oprah Winfrey Scales

	F 1	F 2	F 3
Caring	.83	.20	.05
Friendly	.82	.10	.02
Intelligent	.76	.21	.15
Inquisitive	.76	-.16	.15
Genuine	.73	.36	.14
Good Interviewer	.72	.40	.17
Entertaining	.69	.43	.20
Annoying	-.67	-.41	.11
Knowledgeable	.64	.36	.22
Successful	.63	.02	.45
Conceited/Modest	-.60	-.10	.20
Original	.52	.47	.22
Fat	.03	-.75	.26
Attractive	.46	.56	.13
Funny	.53	.54	.16
Energetic	.29	.48	.47
Aggressive	.11	-.07	.73
Daring	.04	.08	.67
Blunt	-.33	.11	.62
Controversial	.27	-.06	.57

Table 8

Factor Analysis Phil Donahue Scales

	F 1	F 2	F 3	F 4
Knowledgeable	.86	-.05	.17	-.12
Intelligent	.82	-.13	.20	-.09
Successful	.81	-.09	.01	.07
Inquisitive	.71	.12	.15	.20
Genuine	.64	-.23	.35	-.26
Entertaining	.58	-.19	.53	-.28
Handsome	.46	-.28	.43	.11
Rude	-.13	.84	-.13	.11
Blunt	-.04	.81	.07	-.14
Conceited	-.17	.66	-.20	.27
Aggressive	.36	.62	.24	.05
Caring	.43	-.52	.38	-.32
Controversial	.34	.42	.41	-.01
Old	-.12	.27	-.05	.12
Liberal	-.12	.14	.71	.20
Encourages Interaction	.31	-.14	.61	-.13
Funny	.31	-.20	.58	-.36
Open-Minded	.31	-.44	.54	-.20
Dramatic	.27	.12	.50	.33
Devil's Advocate	.04	.13	.06	.82

Table 9

Partial Correlations Controlling for

Sex, Age, Income, Perceived Reality of Television,

& Attitudes Toward Television

	Involvement	Familiarity	Saliency	Exposure
Johnny Carson				
General Image	.54**	.35**	.49**	.33**
Hippness	.30**	.20**	.27**	.18**
Arrogance	-.27**	-.22**	-.15*	-.22**
Wealth	.24**	.27**	.15*	.10
Marital Status	.02	.10	.03	-.09
David Letterman				
General Image	.74**	.57**	.57**	.58**
Arrogance	.09	.16**	-.14*	.22**
Strangeness	-.09	-.03	-.17**	-.00
Oprah Winfrey				
General Image	.61**	.51**	.61**	.33**
Appearance	.14*	.02	.15*	.15*
Controversy	.28**	.30**	.24**	.12*
Phil Donahue				
General Image	.63**	.49**	.60**	.38**
Arrogance	-.17**	-.05	-.19**	-.15*
Liberalness	.22**	.07	.20**	.24**
Conflict	-.02	.10	-.06	-.08

**$p < .01$, *$p < .05$.p